

ROP Renewal - Post Application Survey

Total Responses: 7

Updated July 2012

In order to improve our service, please rate the level of agreement with the following statements (10 = strongly agree, 5 = neutral, and 0 = strongly disagree)

1. Overall, we were satisfied with the ROP application process.

10		3 out of 7 responses		43%
9		2 out of 7 responses		29%
8		2 out of 7 responses		29%
7		0 out of 7 responses		0%
6		0 out of 7 responses		0%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#1)

Much easier than previous system.

Much easier than the former method of completing application forms for existing emission units.

2. The pre-application meeting with agency staff was valuable and helped us with the application process.

10		4 out of 7 responses		57%
9		2 out of 7 responses		29%
8		1 out of 7 responses		14%
7		0 out of 7 responses		0%
6		0 out of 7 responses		0%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%
not applicable		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#2)

This process definately shortened the process. Meeting with the agency staff allowed us to submit a more complete applicaiton request the first time around.

This step enabled us to address comments and questions prior to submission avoiding unnecessary clarification correspondence.

3. The new application process was easier to use than PASS ROP.

10		5 out of 7 responses		71%
9		1 out of 7 responses		14%
8		0 out of 7 responses		0%
7		1 out of 7 responses		14%
6		0 out of 7 responses		0%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%
not applicable		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#3)

Definitely! Less paperwork. Less forms. More stream lines. Did not have to supply information that had already been reviewed and accepted by the agency.

4. The new application process provided a cost and time savings to our company.

10		4 out of 7 responses		57%
9		0 out of 7 responses		0%
8		1 out of 7 responses		14%

7		2 out of 7 responses		29%
6		0 out of 7 responses		0%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#4)

Definate time improvement. The cost to our consultant was cut in half. The most difficult aspect was pull in PTI language into the ROP application.

The process for renewal is a more practical approach that allows the source to concentrate on necessary changes rather than regurgitating information of existing emission units on forms.

Hard to gauge the true cost savings.

5. The application forms were clearly written and intuitive.

10		2 out of 7 responses		29%
9		2 out of 7 responses		29%
8		3 out of 7 responses		43%
7		0 out of 7 responses		0%
6		0 out of 7 responses		0%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#5)

Strong YES! If you read & answer the questions, it directs you right through the process.

There was some confusion around the CAM Plan submittal requirements. It should be clarified that the CAM Plan must be submitted with the application.

6. The application form instructions were clearly written and helpful to the application process.

10		2 out of 7 responses		29%
9		3 out of 7 responses		43%
8		2 out of 7 responses		29%
7		0 out of 7 responses		0%
6		0 out of 7 responses		0%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#6)

There were a couple of items that required verification, but the instructions lead to where to look up definitions or information.

7. The ability to provide a mark-up version of the ROP aided the application process.

10		3 out of 6 responses		50%
9		2 out of 6 responses		33%
8		1 out of 6 responses		17%
7		0 out of 6 responses		0%
6		0 out of 6 responses		0%
5		0 out of 6 responses		0%
4		0 out of 6 responses		0%
3		0 out of 6 responses		0%
2		0 out of 6 responses		0%
1		0 out of 6 responses		0%
0		0 out of 6 responses		0%

Comments (Q#7)

It makes you read the permit, look at what has changed in the permit and to address any open consent orders that may still be open. It forces the applicant to tie up any loose ends.

Allowed the applicant to concentrate on changes.

8. It was clear to us what attachments were required to be included (MAP, PMP, CAM Plan, Fugitive dust, etc.) with the application.

10		1 out of 7 responses		14%
9		2 out of 7 responses		29%
8		3 out of 7 responses		43%
7		0 out of 7 responses		0%
6		1 out of 7 responses		14%
5		0 out of 7 responses		0%
4		0 out of 7 responses		0%
3		0 out of 7 responses		0%
2		0 out of 7 responses		0%
1		0 out of 7 responses		0%
0		0 out of 7 responses		0%
not applicable		0 out of 7 responses		0%

Comments (Q#8)

The application was submitted in hard copy form. After it was submitted, there was a request to send forms electronically. There could be better clarification as to which application elements should be sent in electronic format.

Same comment as before. The CAM Plan was not entirely clear. The instructions should note that the CAM Plan is required to be submitted with the application.

9. District office in which source is located? (optional)

Kalamazoo

Kalamazoo

Lansing

Grand Rapids Office. They did a good job with the pre-meeting and answering questions on the application submittal process.

Grand Rapids

Cadillac

Saginaw Bay District